



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

DIVORCE—ALIMONY—JUDGMENT IN PERSONAM—NON-RESIDENT DEFENDANT.—HOOD v. HOOD, 61 S. E., 471 (GA.).—*Held*, that a judgment in *personam* for temporary alimony and attorney's fees cannot be lawfully rendered in a divorce suit brought against a non-resident husband, who is not served with process within this state and does not appear in the case, but is only constructively served by publication.

A decree for temporary alimony is a judgment in *personam*. *Rigney v. Rigney*, 127 N. Y. 408. As a general proposition, service of process by publication in actions in *personam* is insufficient, as it creates no personal liability in the person so served. *Cook v. Cook*, 56 Wis. 1. The legislature may authorize constructive service by the court within its jurisdiction, but has no authority to authorize such notice upon non-residents. *Darcy v. Ketchum et al.*, 11 Howe 165. And a decree rendered against a non-resident under constructive notice may be held void in a foreign state as not constituting "due process of law" under the Fourteenth Amendment. *Eliot v. McCormick*, 144 Mass. 10.

FRAUDS, STATUTES OF—SALES OF PERSONALITY—CORPORATE STOCK.—SPRAGUE v. HOSIE, 118 N. W. 497 (MICH.).—*Held*, that shares of corporate stock which have been issued, are "goods" within the Statute of Frauds.

Although shares of stock are personal property, it has been held that they are not goods within the Statute of Frauds. 1 *Thomp. Corp.*, Sect. 1068. In England, the weight of authority is that they are not goods. *Humble v. Michell*, 11 A. & E. 205; *Heseltine v. Siggers*, 1 Exch. 856; *Watson v. Spratley*, 10 Exch. 222. And Georgia follows this authority. *Rogers v. Burr*, 105 Ga. 432. But the United States courts as a whole, favor the other view. *North v. Forest*, 15 Conn. 400; *Gooch v. Holmes*, 41 Me. 523; *Baltzen v. Nicolay*, 53 N. Y. 467; *Fine v. Hornsky*, 2 Mo. App. 61; *Ely v. Ormsby*, 14 Barb. 570.

HUSBAND AND WIFE—ALIENATION OF AFFECTIONS—RIGHT OF ACTION BY WIFE.—WORKMAN v. WORKMAN, 85 S. E. 997 (IND.).—*Held*, that a wife may maintain an action for damages for the malicious alienation of her husband's affections.

The modern tendency is to hold that the loss of her husband's *consortium*, gives to the wife a right of action within the meaning of the statutes enabling her to sue alone for an injury to her person, property or personal rights. *Nolan v. Pearson*, 191 Mass. 283; *Wolf v. Frank*, 92 Md. 138. Some decisions hold that also she possesses this right at common law, even to the extent of suing alone. *Foot v. Card*, 58 Conn. 1. But in other cases where the right at common law was claimed, the necessity of joining the husband in the action was acknowledged as a disability, which the statutes have now removed. *Bennett v. Bennett*, 116 N. Y. 584. Some courts deny altogether the existence of this right of action, either at common law or under such statutes. *Duffies v. Duffies*, 76 Wis. 374; *Morgan v. Martin*, 92 Me. 190; *Hodge v. Wetzler*, 69 N. J. L. 490.

INSURANCE—ACCIDENT INSURANCE—ACCIDENTAL MEANS.—SCHMIDT v. INDIANA TRAVELERS' ACC. ASS'N., 85 N. E. 1032.—Where one who carried accident insurance died of circulatory failure and paralysis of the heart